



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/756,833 | 01/14/2004 | Shunpei Yamazaki | 0756-7247 | 2372 |
| 31780 | 7590 | 01/06/2010 | EXAMINER | |
| ERIC ROBINSON | | | CHIENT, LUCY P | |
| PMB 955 | | | | |
| 21010 SOUTHBANK ST. | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165 | | | 2871 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 01/06/2010 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/756,833 | Applicant(s) YAMAZAKI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner LUCY P. CHIEN | Art Unit 2871 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20,46-55,57,59 and 61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,4,9,10,13,14,46,47,49,51,53,55,57 and 59 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8,11,12,15-20,50,52,54 and 61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1/14/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/10/2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-20,46-55,57,59 and 61 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1,3,7,11,48,50,52,54,61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) in view of Jones et al (US 6417899).

Regarding Claim 1,3,7,11,61,

Yamazaki et al discloses (Fig. 12 and Fig. 13) liquid crystal display device having pixel portion comprising: a second plastic substrate (1001) a insulating film (102) a plurality (all the adjacent tft's) of switching element (TFTs) formed on the insulating film (102); a plurality of electrodes (pixel electrodes [0017] electrically connected to the plurality of switching elements (202,TFT); a liquid crystal material adjacent to the plurality of electrodes; and a second (counter) substrate (1001) wherein the switching device (TFT) and the liquid crystal cell (1004) are formed between the first substrate (1108) and the second plastic substrate (1008); an adhesive (1107) adhering the insulating (102) layer with the substrate (1108).

Yamazaki et al does not disclose a backlight and wherein the first plastic substrate is larger than the second substrate; A polarizing plate formed over the resin, an insulating film adhered to the polarizing plate with an adhesive.

Okazaki et al discloses (Fig. 6 and Fig.10) using the light emitting element as a backlight for LCD (column 1, lines 5-10) a first substrate (16) a light emitting diode (Column 3, lines 17-30) formed in the concave portion (20) of the first substrate (also formed over the first substrate) (16) a metal film (19) formed over the plastic substrate (16), a resin (Column 3, lines 17-30) covering the light emitting device (1) used as back light for liquid crystal displays. Therefore, the first substrate of Yamazaki (1108) would have Okazaki's concavity with an LED surrounded by a resin attached to Yamazaki's adhesive (1107). This device is used to improve the light emission efficiency and the quality of the product (Column 2, rows 35-40).

Shiraishi discloses the first substrate (11) is larger than the second substrate (12) to provide extra length portion (3) to have the terminal portion (31).

Jones et al discloses (Fig. 4) an internal polarizer (65) is added to Yamazaki's display. The internal polarizer can be placed into Yamazaki's display in between 117 and 1106. Therefore, the polarizing plate would be formed over the resin of Okazaki et al. It is known in the art to use adhesive layers to provide better mutual adhesions between layers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify Yamazaki's display to include Okazaki et al's backlight with light emitting device to improve the light emission efficiency and the quality of the product

(Column 2, rows 35-40) and to include Shiraishi's larger first substrate motivated by the desire to provide a extra length portion to have a terminal portion [0009]. To also include Jones et al's internal polarizer motivated by the desire to minimize adverse environmental effects. (column 10, rows 49-56).

Regarding Claim 48,50,

In addition to Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi as disclosed above, Okazaki et al discloses (Column 8, rows 30-34) the resin comprises a transparent particle.

Regarding Claim 52,54,

In addition to Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi as disclosed above, Okazaki et al discloses (Column 3, rows 1-10) the light emitting device includes a pair of electrodes. Thus preventing the appearance of the product from deteriorating when the surface mounting of the light emitting element is soldered. (Column 3, rows 32-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Kim et al's display to include Okazaki et al's pair of electrodes motivated by the desire to prevent the appearance of the product from deteriorating when the surface mounting of the light emitting element is soldered (Column 3, rows 32-38).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) and of Jones et al (US 6417899 in view of Oguchi et al (US 4648691)

Regarding Claim 5,

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi disclose everything as disclosed above.

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi do not disclose the metal film being sand blasted.

Oguchi et al discloses sand blasting the metal film in order to form a rugged surface suitable to be used in a display to provide a higher degree of whiteness. (Col. 8, rows 21-37)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Okazaki et al, Jones et al, Shiraishi I and Yamazaki's display to include Oguchi et al's sand blasting method of the metal film in order to form a rugged surface suitable to be used in a display to provide a higher degree of whiteness. (Col. 8, rows 21-37)

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable of Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) and of Jones et al (US 6417899 in view of Yokoyama et al (US 20020041348).

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi disclose everything as disclosed above.

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi do not disclose the use of a transparent liquid crystal.

Yokoyama et al in the abstract discloses the use of a transparent liquid crystal cell that controls passage of light emitted from the surface (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify Okazaki et al, Jones et al, Shiraishi and Yamazaki to include Yokoyama et al's transparent liquid crystal to control passages of the light emitted from the surface of the display (see abstract).

Claim 8,12,are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) and of Jones et al (US 6417899 in view of Weindorf et al (US 20020130985).

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi disclose everything as disclosed above.

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi do not disclose the use of a flexible printed wiring board.

Weindorf et al discloses (Page 3, [0033]) using a flexible printed wiring board connected to the i-emitting diode that is supplied with current to eliminate the need for daughter boards or other LED's which are more expensive.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify of Okazaki et al, Jones et al, Shiraishi and Yamazaki to include Weindorf's flexible printed wiring board to eliminate the need for daughter boards or other interconnecting devices or the more expensive side-lighting LEDs also to provide the display with flexibility (Page 3, [0033]).

Claim 15,17,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) and of Jones et al (US 6417899) in view of Chaudhari et al (US 6331381).

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi disclose everything as disclosed above.

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi do not disclose the liquid crystal displays used in a cellular phone, wrist watch, and personal computer.

Chaudhari et al discloses (Column 1, Row 13-16) the use of LCD's in a cellular phone, wrist watch, and personal computers to provide a displaying image in the products.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify of Okazaki et al, Jones et al, Shiraishi and Yamazaki include Chaudhari et al's liquid crystal displays in a cellular phone, wrist watch, and personal computers with a display that is light and thin such as an LCD.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) and of Jones et al (US 6417899) in view of Kawagoe et al (US 5781263).

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi disclose everything as disclosed above.

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi do not disclose the liquid crystal displays used in an electronic book.

Kawagoe et al discloses (Column Row) the use of a LCD in an electronic book.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify Okazaki et al, Jones et al, Shiraishi and Yamazaki to include Kawagoe et al's liquid crystal displays in an electronic book to provide it with a display that is light and thin such as an LCD.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) and of Jones et al (US 6417899) in view of Washizuka et al (US 4202607).

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi disclose everything as disclosed above.

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi do not disclose the liquid crystal displays used in a front glass.

Washizuka et al discloses (Abstract) the use of an LCD in a front glass such as a mirror or window.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify of Okazaki et al, Jones et al, Shiraishi and Yamazaki to include Washizuka et al's liquid crystal displays in a front glass to provide the front glass with a display that is light and thin such as an LCD.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 20010040645) and of Okazaki et al (US 5298768) and of Shiraishi (US 20010012089) and of Jones et al (US 6417899) in view of Boutaleb et al (US 4536014).

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi disclose everything as disclosed above.

Yamazaki, Okazaki et al, Jones et al, and Shiraishi do not disclose the liquid crystal displays used in an electronic card.

Boutaleb et al discloses (Column 4, Row 13-24) the use of a LCD in a credit card.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify of Okazaki et al, Jones et al, Shiraishi and Yamazaki to include Boutaleb et al's liquid crystal displays in an electronic card to provide the electronic card with a display that is light and thin such as an LCD.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUCY P. CHIEN whose telephone number is (571)272-8579. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571)272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lucy P Chien

Application/Control Number: 10/756,833
Art Unit: 2871

Page 11

Examiner
Art Unit 2871

/David Nelms/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2871